NATIONAL REVIEW

25 Cents

June 21, 1958

A WEEKLY JOURNAL OF OPINION

Max Eastman vs. Russell Kirk on John Dewey

Voluntary Taxation: A Symposium

FELIX MORLEY · MURRAY N. ROTHBARD

HENRY HAZLITT · FRANK CHODOROV

They Got Strauss

AN EDITORIAL

Articles and Reviews by · · · · · · RICHARD M. WEAVER

L. BRENT BOZELL · JAMES BURNHAM · ANTHONY LEJEUNE

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For the Record

Congressional leaders have arrived at a working understanding. If there is another Little Rock in the fall, Congress will reconvene notwithstanding the pressure of electioneering. . . . Cyrus Eaton's attacks on the FBI made page 1 of the New York Times. Attorney General Rogers' answer got page 15. . . . The Pentagon is bitter over the fact that there is more pressure on Congress for foreign aid than for legislation to maintain our army strength at the 900,000-man level.

Diplomatic reports from Moscow predict that Premier Khrushchev will summon the Central Committee of the Communist Party to complete the demotion of his predecessor, Bulganin. The London Daily Mail suspects that Malenkov has been liquidated on Khrushchev's orders. . . . Dr. Bela Fabian, Chairman of the Federation of Hungarian Former Political Prisoners, was refused "just five minutes" before the Bar Association audience in Baltimore which heard Soviet Ambassador Mikhail Menshikov last week. . . . Business is looking up for the Communist Worker, which gave up its daily edition last January and now publishes Sunday only. This year's prospective deficit being only $70,000, plans are being made to resume daily publication.

The Senate has approved appropriations of $10 million to build five "demonstration" plants to convert sea-water for human use. Four of the plants will be in the continental U.S., one in a territorial possession. . . . GOP congressional candidates are finding rising food prices—up almost 7 per cent in the past year—a source of campaign anguish. . . . Commercial television will play crime down instead of up this fall. The industry finally is impatient with the saturation of crime shows and the bad reaction in police and education circles. . . . N.Y. Republican State Chairman Judson Morhouse's lobbying for Nelson Rockefeller has affronted the professionals. . . . Adam Clayton Powell Jr. made a hyper-genteel appearance before N.Y. Young Republicans. He will accept Republican designation.

A major headache for General de Gaulle: the number of Communists in the French Army. Some sources say that below the officer corps as many as one French soldier in four is a Communist.

NATIONAL REVIEW

A WEEKLY JOURNAL OF OPINION

EDITOR: Wm. F. Buckley Jr.
PUBLISHER: William A. Rusher

EDITORS
L. Brent Bozell — James Burnham
John Chamberlain — Whittaker Chambers
Willmoore Kendall — Suzanne La Follette
Frank S. Meyer

PRODUCTION EDITOR: Mabel Wood
WASHINGTON CORRESPONDENT: Sam M. Jones

ASSOCIATES
Maureen L. Buckley — Priscilla L. Buckley
Jonathan Mitchell — Morrie Ryskind

CONTRIBUTORS
C. D. Batchelor, John C. Caldwell, Frank Chodorov, John Abbott Clark, Forrest Davis, A. Derso, Max Eastman, Medford Evans, Karl Hess, John D. Kreuttner, J. B. Matthews, Gerhart Niemeyer, Revilo Oliver, E. Merrill Root, Richard M. Weaver, Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, Gen. Charles A. Willoughby, Garry Wills

FOREIGN CONTRIBUTORS
London: Anthony Lejeune — *Madrid*: J. Dervin
Munich: E. v. Kuehnelt-Leddihn

ASSISTANT TO THE PUBLISHER: J. P. McFadden

CONTENTS JUNE 21, 1958 VOL. VI, NO. 1

THE WEEK 3

ARTICLES
The Reaction Against John Dewey — Max Eastman 9
John Dewey Pragmatically Tested — Russell Kirk 11
Voluntary Taxation? 13
Comments by Felix Morley, Murray N. Rothbard, Henry Hazlitt, Frank Chodorov

DEPARTMENTS
For the Record 2
National Trends ..... L. Brent Bozell 8
Letter from London ..... Anthony Lejeune 17
To the Editor 22

BOOKS, ARTS, MANNERS
The Lincoln-Douglas Debates — Richard M. Weaver 18
Half-Gods of American Literature — Richard McLaughlin 19
A Movie for Grownups ..... James Burnham 20
Books in Brief 21

NATIONAL REVIEW is published weekly, except for Christmas week, and fortnightly during July and August, by National Weekly, Inc.

Copyrighted 1958 in the U.S.A. by National Weekly, Inc.

Second-class mail privileges authorized at Orange, Conn.

EDITORIAL AND SUBSCRIPTION OFFICES:
211 East 37th St.
New York 16, N.Y.
Telephone MUrray Hill 2-0941

PUBLISHED AT ORANGE, CONN.
RATES: Twenty-five cents a copy, $8.00 a year, $15.00 for two years. Foreign: $10.00 a year; Canada, $9.00 a year.

The editors cannot be responsible for unsolicited manuscripts unless return postage, or better, a stamped self-addressed envelope is enclosed. Opinions expressed in signed articles do not necessarily represent the views of the editors.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The WEEK

● Soviet Ambassador Mikhail Menshikov has become something of a social lion around Washington simply by grinning—a facial exercise rarely indulged in by previous emissaries of Murder, Inc. Not long ago a bevy of Republican ladies from Ohio, in Washington for a meeting, called on him, and then gushed to the press that he was "cute." The latest organization to go in for this kind of thing is the New York Young Republican Club, which has scheduled a nose-rubbing session with Menshikov as a part of its annual pilgrimage to Washington. We are assured that no harm comes of these visits, however; Ambassador Menshikov has not yet persuaded a single *Republican* to spit on Vice President Nixon.

● The voters of Alabama have overwhelmingly approved an amendment to the election law which leaves the Alabama Presidential electors free to cast their votes for any one they choose, regardless of which party carries the state on election day. Georgia has a similar law on its books, and between now and convention-time, 1960, other Southern states are expected to follow suit. It should act as a timely warning to party chiefs that, although Little Rock finished the Republican Party in the South, it did not rehabilitate in Southern minds a Democratic leadership whose policies could only lead to more Little Rocks in the future.

● The school board of Arlington County, Virginia, has been ordered by the courts to begin integration next fall, and there seems to be no legal recourse left open to it. Conceivably, rather than integrate, the councilmen will abandon the public schools, enabling legislation having been voted in Richmond two years ago. But residents of Arlington observe that the county has a very small percentage of Negroes, with the result that, compared to other counties in the state, integration actually is feasible. They fear, though, that integration would bring on a mass immigration of Negroes from contiguous counties; whereupon, the situation would become explosive . . . and the county would face an emigration of whites. It is with reference to these speculations that Arlingtonians will decide what action to take in September.

● The Army's report on the war potential of the Soviet Union, presented to Congress last week, was intended to be sobering, as indeed it was. The Soviet Union, with 175 line divisions, 20,000 war-planes and a 500-submarine navy, is capable of unleashing a major land war without using weapons of mass destruction, the Army warned. Moreover, it is the only nation in the world capable of immediately mobilizing and equipping large and well-trained reserves. Our high command has made the best case it can for larger defense appropriations. Congress should bear in mind that not since we demobilized in 1945 have we presumed to match the Russians rifle-for-rifle. The case certainly is made for continuing with the development of nuclear weapons for strategic and tactical use.

● In Khrushchev's reshufflings of the Soviet leadership during the past year, the speediest political advance has been made by F. R. Koslov, who, after becoming a regular member of the Presidium last June (when Malenkov, Molotov and Kaganovich were thrown out), was more recently named First Deputy Premier. Judging in part from his appearance at Khrushchev's side in official photographs, many analysts consider him to be the current No. Two. Koslov's place as premier of the Russian Socialist Soviet Republic was taken by Dmitri Poliansky, an old colleague of Khrushchev's in the Ukrainian Party apparatus. Both Koslov and Poliansky are known as anti-Semites, and were active in the widespread Soviet anti-Semitic campaign of 1952-53. Their present prominence may be related to the Khrushchev-Nasser operation against Israel that is believed to be in preparation.

● The Liberal press, so much of which viewed the possibility of de Gaulle's ascendancy with the enthusiasm of the Bourbons on learning that Napoleon had left Elba, has eased over, in recent weeks, to a position of near-total support, brought on by de Gaulle's "moderation," and by his inclusion in his cabinet of Mollet, Pinay, and Pflimlin. In a short time the press legitimized the new Premier and but for the fact that it is simply not possible, would almost surely have become more Gaullist than de Gaulle. We continue disappointed by de Gaulle's entourage, though reassured by André Malraux's good-humored confirmation of our suspicion that de Gaulle didn't pick a cabinet, but rather a staff. ("How was the Cabinet meeting?" Malraux was asked by the press on leaving the Élysée Palace. "Napoleonic," he replied.) De Gaulle's decisive handling of the generals is also encouraging. It is too early to know for sure just where he is headed, or whether he will get there. But one can be grateful, at least, that he has taken Khrushchev off the front pages.

● It's about over now in Indonesia, even the fighting. The rebels, who in their naiveté had looked to the West for help against the pro-Communist Sukarno

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

regime, are taking to the hills. Among anti-Communist heads of state, about the only one to emerge from the Indonesian débâcle with honor is President Syngman Rhee, who urged the Korean National Assembly as recently as last week (it was his first appearance before that body in four years) to support the embattled Sumatrans with arms and equipment.

● Addressing a YWCA meeting in Chicago, Dr. Percy Julian, a prominent Negro scientist on the board of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, deplored the tendency of American publicists to ignore or "rationalize" an "increase in the Negro crime rate" so precipitous as to strike "those who have struggled so long to merit freedom with panic." While "a conspiracy of silence" will not lessen the Negro crime rate, Dr. Julian suggests that "a realization of the Christian imperative, 'I am my brother's keeper,'" will. Specifically he urges radio stations not to sell time to the crop of religious fanatics whose antics are driving Negro children "out of the [very] church which was the builder of character in the generation that brought the Negro to his present high level of achievement." Dr. Julian understands that only by facing up to the truth are we made free.

● Have critics of the Supreme Court exaggerated the effect of its recent decisions on the internal security program? Not according to our most strategically-situated observer of such things, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, who recently brought to the attention of a congressional committee the following home truths: 1) Forty-nine out of 108 persons who have been convicted by juries for Smith Act violations are today free as a result of the decisions in question. 2) The Court's decisions have posed "critical challenges" to the problem of law enforcement, so that 3) the time has come to call upon the courts to "come to grips in a realistic manner with the facts and join [up] . . . in protecting society." Mr. Hoover did not say anything about the corrective legislation now lying before Congress, but (as our grandfather used to say) he was evidently thinking about it awful loud.

● The Junior Chamber of Commerce of Norwalk, Conn., a civic group with a membership of seventeen, recently set out to present a series of three lectures entitled "Freedom Answers Communism." The lecturers were to be Dr. Bella Dodd, Louis Budenz and Herbert Philbrick. After surveying the results—fifty people at Dr. Dodd's talk, under a hundred at Mr. Budenz'—the Junior Chamber, its treasury exhausted, decided it would have to cancel Mr. Philbrick's appearance. The story was totally unexceptional; or is the apathy of the American people about Communism newsworthy? In point of fact, audiences of fifty to a hundred for serious anti-Communist lecturers are perfectly respectable, however unfeasible they may be financially. But two curious things happened: the *New York Times,* which generally knows that dog bites man is not news, publicized the series' failure ("Anti-Red Lecturers Find Norwalk Cool"); and the Junior Chamber received a number of vituperative telephone calls, some of them anonymous. One caller—the one the *Times* quoted—denounced the JC for sponsoring so "silly" a project (anti-Communist lectures). The net impact: civic groups which have read in the *Times* of the Norwalk experience will think twice about inviting anti-Communists to speak.

● The NLRB's decision—in the teeth of Big Labor opposition—that paid labor union organizers have a right to organize on their own behalf strikes us as downright funny. At the moment we are laughing at the AFL-CIO for being hoist by their own petard. We assume, of course, that organizers of labor organizers will sue to maintain a separate union; and why shouldn't they?

They Got Strauss

Out of context, no particular comment would be called for on the President's nomination of Mr. John A. McCone of Los Angeles as a member and presumptively the chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. It has all the familiar stigmata of "the typical Eisenhower appointment." Mr. McCone is a personal friend and golfing companion—a fellow-member, indeed, of Washington's Burning Tree Country Club. As an engineer and businessman he has proved his talents and made his fortune in activities ranging from steel-making to shipping to—very relevantly—the building of atomic reactors. It is even rumored that Mr. McCone favors private over socialist enterprise, thus belonging more on the Charles Wilson than the Paul Hoffman wing of the Eisenhower staff; and by general account he shares Charley Wilson's ignorance of, and indifference to, the intricacies of Communism, Soviet policy and international affairs. Washington experience? Yes—Mr. McCone held Washington posts from 1948 to 1951 under President Truman.

We have no quarrel with Mr. McCone, and will keep our hopes up, though our guard also will be up. For the significance of the appointment lies in the simple fact that the President deserted Admiral Lewis Strauss.

To be sure, Mr. Strauss is a man so sensitive to criticism that the prospect of another four years on the firing line must have appalled him. Perhaps the President offered to reappoint Strauss—it is likely

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DON'T LET EATON, OPPENHEIMER, PAULING AND KHRUSHCHEV DOWN!
STOP
NUCLEAR TESTS!
THE SANDS ARE RUNNING OUT- ACT NOW WHILE WE CAN STILL BURY OUR HEADS!

Kreuttner

"Why look hard at Peace Groups when you can hope for the best and wring your hands later?"

that he did. But it is certain that, bowing to pressure, he did not urge Strauss to accept another term, promising to do everything in his power to secure ratification, and support Strauss' position on nuclear development. Thus the desertion was executed in General Eisenhower's typical manner: not by an open facing of the issue, but by an exchange of political mash notes, and the hollow assignment of Admiral Strauss—that heroic guardian of the nation's nuclear fortress—to the Malenkovian post of "special advisor to the White House on the peaceful uses of atomic energy."

Unbroken retreats, the repeated failure to respond to the opponent's challenge, the abandonment of allies and principles, are transformed in due course from tactical maneuvers—justified perhaps by the momentary conditions of the struggle—to *the habit of appeasement.* If we are abject before Tito and Nehru, then why not before Nasser? If we desert the Hungarian workers and students, shall we then bestir ourselves for the Indonesian rebels? If we abandon our fliers to Red China, then why not to East Germany?

It is the same habit of appeasement that brought the desertion of Lewis Strauss. Senators Clinton Anderson and Henry Jackson of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy are, in this encounter, only pawns in the world game. They were out to get Strauss—they made no bones about it—and they threatened to fight on the Senate floor against confirmation, should he be renominated. If the commander had stood bravely by his man, and called on the nation to show its backing of one who had served so well, the Anderson-Jackson cabal would have dissolved in a shower of empty rhetoric. But the General, true to form, capitulated.

Senators Anderson and Jackson were not, as we say, principals in this struggle over the Strauss renomination, and it was not to them that Mr. Eisenhower was basically surrendering. Admiral Strauss has been both a leader and a symbol of what remains in this nation of a spirit of resistance to the Soviet world offensive. That is why he was marked years ago by the Kremlin for political isolation and slaughter. That is why the Kremlin's agents and dupes among us, the friends of Oppenheimer, the appeasers, the pacifists, have been centering their fire on Strauss. To grasp the meaning of the desertion of Admiral Strauss, we need only ask: who will most rejoice that his hand has been taken from the wheel? When the news reached the Kremlin, did Khrushchev mourn a defeat—or toast a victory?

Senator Johnson Lies Down

Developments on the Jenner-Butler Bill to undo some of the Supreme Court's recent mischief:

1. Justice Learned Hand has been widely represented as having opposed, in a letter to Senator Hennings, the Jenner-Butler Bill. Senator Butler wrote to Justice Hand, to ask whether in fact he opposed the Jenner Bill, as amended by Senator Butler, or whether he opposed merely the single provision of the current bill removing from the Supreme Court jurisdiction over state laws governing the licensing of lawyers. Justice Hand wrote back on May 26 that "apparently what I wrote has been misunderstood as including an opinion touching the substantive aspects of Sections II and IV" of the bill (*i.e.*, the provisions designed, by clarification of congressional sentiment, to set aside *Yates, Watkins,* and *Cole*). "I did not mean to express any such opinion. The sections raise questions whose merits . . . may come for decision before the lower courts, and it appears to me undesirable that I should discuss this aspect of them while I remain a judge." In other words, Justice Hand stands by his Harvard lectures, in which he criticized the Supreme Court for presumptuousness that led Senators Jenner and Butler, with the backing of the Judiciary Committee, to seek redress through legislation.

2. Senator Lyndon Johnson has announced that the Democratic Policy Committee of the Senate has de-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

clined to schedule the Butler Bill for floor debate. The decision of Senator Johnson has the practical effect of killing the bill during this session and stranding the nation, for another year, with a confused and ineffectual internal security system. It is widely known that whenever Senator Johnson feels the urge to act the statesman at the cost of a little political capital, he lies down until he gets over it. He is moved to defer action on the bill because it would sunder the Democratic Party. Conservative Democrats would back it enthusiastically, while the Liberals would inveigh against it. Better one less division in Democratic ranks, reasons the Senate majority leader, than an effective program of internal security.

Margin for Hope

Mr. John J. Synon of San Rafael, California, very nearly won the Republican nomination for Congress in Marin County last week, and thereby hangs a tale.

John Synon styled himself the "Right-to-Work Republican Candidate for Congress," and in his intensive campaign for the nomination, made possible by the sacrifices of dozens of volunteers, he never deviated from his central plank: "I believe in voluntary unionism and support the right of every person either to join or not to join a trade union, as his conscience and judgment dictate." There were nine other planks to his platform, all of them politically consistent, and all of them put forward with corresponding clarity (*e.g.*, "I favor radical reduction in all farm subsidies with a terminal date set when such subsidies will no longer be paid." "I favor the abolition [not just the reduction] of many governmental agencies"). And Mr. Synon's campaign was carried on with intelligence, dignity and moderation.

Which, given the nature of the opposition, must have been hard. For John Synon was once a drunkard. Since 1942, he has not had a drink. He resumed his career as newspaperman, entered politics, and by 1954 found himself private secretary to Governor Goodwin Knight, in charge of a staff of sixty people. But following Governor Knight's capitulation to the barons of organized labor, Synon quit; and now he works as a member of the State Industrial Accident Commission.

Synon's bid for the Republican nomination was resisted by filthy and craven attacks upon him not only by organized labor, but by emissaries of Governor Knight, who evidently felt that putting the spotlight on Synon's remote alcoholic past would distract from the Governor's continuing political pusillanimity. The smear almost didn't work: indeed, it is safe to say that it did not work; for Synon's opponent had organization support, and therefore the heavy advantage. But Synon came so close that twenty-four hours after the election, morning papers in the county were still saying that it was impossible to name the winner.

Well, Synon lost. But he feels that his experience foretells an upset victory by Senator Knowland this fall, provided Senator Knowland hews faithfully to the line he took in Los Angeles last February: I will not stand aside while California is colonized by Walter Reuther. If Synon was able to do what he did against such long odds, he reasons, Senator Knowland, with the official backing of the Republican Party, can do much, much more.

"Come on in," John Synon urges political aspirants of conservative bent, "the water's fine."

Off at the End

Why, at just *this* moment in the history of the Republic, a pay increase for *one million* U.S. government employees? How come not a *single* dissent in the House's "voice vote" that made the increase certain? Why, if an increase was called for, as much as 10 per cent; and why retroactive to January 1?

The increase, surely, was not voted, with the nation's major industries knee-deep in depression, because the government is losing employees in large numbers to what is fashionably called the "private sector" of the economy. And not, surely, because the increase is dictated by recognized principles of distributive justice: nobody seems to be claiming, any more, to know what those principles are, and nobody, certainly, has made the kind of canvass of conflicting current claims to greater rewards that would necessarily precede the application of those principles in the present situation.

The increase, then, occurs at this time for the worst of possible reasons. The prospective beneficiaries, with an election coming up, are strong enough to make such a Treasury raid and get away with it; and there is no need to justify it on grounds either of justice or prudence.

No one could ask a more eloquent reminder of the ease with which the kind of state we are running in America reduces itself to sheer competition among rival interest groups for swag, and of the central danger of such a state, which is that as the government employees become more numerous, and thus better able to threaten elected officials with their putative capacity to sway votes, other policy considerations get subordinated to the twofold demand for more government functions and better pay for the jobholders required to administer them. And, off at the end, economic ruin and the eclipse of freedom.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Harlequinade in Harlem

Representative Adam Clayton Powell Jr., deprived of the backing of the Democratic Party (though Powell may well win the Democratic primary fight), has now been awarded the support of 1) the Communist Party, and 2) the Republican Party. The Communists are backing him because, in the words of Mr. Benjamin Davis, state chairman of the Communist Party, Powell is "a symbol of the whole national Negro liberation movement on the political and electoral front," the "foremost spokesman of Negro and other minorities in Congress." Harlem Republicans are backing him—they have a *grand* rationale—because they do not propose to sit idly by and allow the Democrats to punish Powell for having come out for Eisenhower in 1956.

It is to the credit of the top leaders of the New York Republican Party, notably Mr. Thomas Curran and Mrs. Preston Davie, that there was hot resistance to the idea; but the Powellites prevailed, and set into motion the machinery which, in due course, is sure to give the Republican nomination to Powell. The Republican Party, at least at some lower levels, is so unprincipled as to have made it inevitable, it seems, that, the Democrats having finally relinquished him, the Republicans should rush forward eagerly to co-opt the most vulgar politician in Washington. After all (Harlem Republican leaders must have reasoned at the heated session of New York Republican district leaders), if General Eisenhower himself was happy to have Powell's support (announced on the steps of the White House in October 1956), surely *we* need not be squeamish about embracing him in the Republican fold . . . It matters not that Powell's racism, his record as fellow-traveler, his totalitarian assaults upon those who oppose him, would appear to make him alien to any civilized political slate—he'll get more votes for the Republican Party in Harlem than ever the Party was able to get before, and what other argument is relevant in Modern Republicanism?

Well, here's to a Democratic victory in Harlem in November.

Virtue Is its Own Disappointment

At the time of the Suez crisis, when Western Europe was suddenly bereft of the oil it had been getting from the Near East, President Eisenhower asked the major American oil companies to move heaven and earth to keep Frenchmen and Belgians and Britishers from freezing. To ease the job, the government specifically exempted the companies from certain provisions of the anti-trust legislation. The major oil concerns were permitted to confer on ship movements, on the jockeying of supplies in hand, and on other things relevant to changing the direction of western hemisphere oil flow.

That the oil companies rose to the occasion is a fact of history: Western Europe was not seriously inconvenienced during the Suez crisis winter. Instead of conferring medals upon the companies for their prompt action, however, the U.S. government, through the Department of Justice, is now pushing a "criminal price-fixing" case against Standard Oil (N.J.), the Texas Company, the Shell Oil Company, and so on. A federal grand jury, sitting in Alexandria, Virginia, has just returned an indictment against the companies charging them with violations of Section 1 of the Sherman Act. The Department of Justice alleges that the oil companies not only pooled information about shipping problems but also engaged in some collusive shenanigans leading to a concerted price rise for both crude oil and gasoline.

The facts in the case have yet to reach the public. But on the face of it, oil and gasoline prices a) would have risen at the time of the Suez crisis for natural economic reasons, and b) would have tended to stabilize at a given point. That is the general law of economics, as any college sophomore who has ever studied marginal utility and the intersection of supply and demand curves could tell the Department of Justice. If the DJ hasn't any better evidence of collusion and "price fixing" than the natural behavior of the oil and gasoline market during a period of sudden scarcity, it had better call off its dogs.

Meanwhile, the oil companies have had a taste of government gratitude. At the moment they are probably recalling Mark Twain's wounded bemusement when a friend turned against him. Said the satirist, when an erstwhile bosom companion was reported to be maligning him, "I must have done the s.o.b. a favor."

Notes and Asides

We are happy to report that our colleague and friend, Mr. C. D. Batchelor (whose cartoons have enlivened some of our darkest pages), is the star of an exhibition being held at the New York Historical Society (170 Central Park West) from now until the end of July. Of the 34 drawings on display, probably the most famous is a reproduction of "Madam War," which appeared in the *New York Daily News* in 1937, and was the first cartoon in a tabloid newspaper to win a Pulitzer Prize.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NATIONAL TRENDS

L. BRENT BOZELL

Brown Tuesday

Their hero might run behind Pat Brown in the primary, the Knowland forces figured, on account of his absence from the state. But anyone predicting the discrepancy might run to 650,000 votes would probably have been dismissed on loyalty grounds. Make no mistake about it: the returns jolted the Senator's camp. While the mood is far from defeatist, most would agree that the present odds, by objective standards, are against his election. As the Knowland men look ahead, it is not only Brown's margin of victory that bodes ill in November, but the size of the vote that produced the margin. A whopping 60 per cent of the California electorate went to the polls on June 3. This means that Knowland's principal hope lies in changing the minds of people who have already declared against him. More ominous still, Republicans managed to vote 63 per cent of their registrants, compared with a 58 per cent turnout on the Democratic side. This means that among the voters who have yet to be heard from, a sizeable majority (sizeable, since there are three California Democrats to two Republicans, anyway) are affiliated with Pat Brown's party.

Why did things go badly?

Senator Knowland himself has laid the blame on two factors—his absence from the fray, and the recession. There is certainly no denying the importance of the first. Since January, Knowland has managed to spend only fourteen days—including election day—in California. This would be a formidable handicap in any gubernatorial campaign; against the likes of Pat Brown, it was courting disaster. Brown, as anyone who has lived in California during the past decade knows, is a top-notch campaigner. He is the twenty-hours-a-day type, who, besides, knows and practices all the tricks of the craft. A few weeks back, an effort to prevent boys from building tree houses kicked up a political storm in the state. California politicians all rushed into print to champion the cause of the boys. Pat Brown climbed a tree. Then, too, Brown is a veteran of many state-wide campaigns: the voters know him, and, all things considered, think him a nice fellow. He is not the man, in a word—even for someone of Knowland's prominence—to cede monopoly rights on the hustings.

Knowland's point about economic conditions is less easy to assess. To be sure, California has had a minor unemployment problem; and, as the Senator suggests, the recent upturn in the state probably came too late to influence voters who were inclined to blame Republicans for loss of jobs. But the state, as a whole, has not been hard enough hit to account for more than a small segment of Brown's plurality.

The Right-to-Work Issue

There are two other factors that unquestionably played a role. One was the Senator's chosen issue, the right-to-work law. The unions went into high gear on this one—not only to defeat Knowland, but to defeat a petition for placing a right-to-work referendum on the November ballot. In this latter task, they failed (more than the required 325,000 Californians went on record favoring the referendum). But the vast union propaganda effort against the referendum was all gravy for Pat Brown. *E. g.:* Huge advertisements denounced "this union-busting law." In the light of Knowland's deliberate identification of himself with the law, the effect of the campaign was to make Knowland the "union-busting" candidate for governor.

The outcome does not prove—not by any means—that it is impossible to sell the right-to-work idea in states where labor is strongly organized. But it goes a fairly long way toward proving that, faced with determined union opposition, the idea will not sell itself. There is only one answer to the kind of demagoguery the unions exhibited in California—the same kind they employed several years ago in the campaign against the "Slave-Labor Act." Bob Taft provided it in Ohio: patient, dispassionate, repeated explanations of the issue, not through press releases or Senate speeches but in the heart of the industrial districts, to the workers in their factories. Bill Knowland, because of his duties in Washington, could not provide that anwer in California, at least not in the primary. But one suspects that he is fully capable of doing so, and that therefore June may be an unreliable measure of November.

The other thing that helped do the Senator in was the intra-party fight with the Knight organization. The Knight forces, naturally enough, wanted *their* man in Sacramento in 1960; as Knowland also understands, it is the place for a California politician to be when the Presidential sweepstakes roll around. When Knowland declared for the job, the Knight organization wanted to fight it out in the primary, and tended to blame Knowland for an alleged "deal" that sent Goodie, instead, after the Washington job. The charge is unjust. Knowland wanted a primary contest with Knight: he thought he would win handily, and thus enhance his prestige in the state and national party. The man who forced the "deal" (this column, November 16, 1957) was Richard Nixon. Nevertheless, the culprit in the eyes of many Knight men is Knowland, and there is evidence that they took a walk in the gubernatorial primary.

What are the prospects of turning things around in November? Gloomy, your correspondent believes, but far from hopeless. The Senator will be in the front lines from the middle of August on; once he gets going, even the indefatigable Mr. Brown will have a hard time keeping up. The recession could disappear. The Knight forces will get into line: Goodie didn't do too well himself, and will need the fullest cooperation from Knowland. The key, however, is the right-to-work issue. If Knowland can capture the offensive on the labor question and convincingly pose his rule as the alternative to Big Labor's, it might be another Ohio.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Reaction Against John Dewey

The malign role which conservatives assign to John Dewey has been exaggerated, says Max Eastman. Not so, replies Russell Kirk, if we judge his works by his own pragmatic standards

MAX EASTMAN

Strange things happen to a man who has changed his mind in midlife on a vital question. Strictly speaking, I did not change my mind about socialism, for I always thought of it as an experiment; I became convinced during the thirties that the experiment had been sufficiently tried and had failed. The enemy of freedom, I learned, is not capitalistic business but the overgrown State.

This change was profound enough to shift me into a different group of intellectual associates and even, to a certain degree, of friends. I find myself now in the company of a group who call themselves libertarian conservatives. Many of them cherish religious notions which I regard as primitive mythology, and which I think diminish their influence, but their zeal for limited government, individualism, and a free market as the basis of other freedoms, makes our association pleasant and inevitable.

This is a long introduction to an essay on John Dewey, but it is not irrelevant. For one of the strangest things that has befallen me as a result of my changed associations is to find this early friend and wise teacher, whom I always thought of as rather painfully conservative, denounced by my political confrères as the arch-demon of radicalism. There is hardly a name, except possibly that of Karl Marx, that is more strictly anathema in the circles of the new conservatism than that of John Dewey. He is regarded as the fountain-source of every horror from teenage delinquency to the confiscatory taxes of the Welfare State. Indeed I wouldn't be surprised if a good proportion of the younger recruits to this banner think of John Dewey as the man who introduced socialism into the United States.

In my life he functioned as a stubborn and somewhat fatherly *opposition* to my youthful impulse to take up with the socialist idea.

"Society is not divided into two distinct classes, as the socialists assert," he would say.

"Yes, but by acting on the hypothesis that it is, we can *split* society in two," I would answer. "What we need is a working hypothesis, something to act on, instead of a lot of vague ideas about how things might get better."

He was never in a hurry to answer such bright but incautious ideas. He would smile indulgently and rub his chin and not say anything, but I could guess what he was thinking. I was teaching logic out of Stanley Jevons' famous book on *The Principles of Science,* and I was recklessly glib in transferring the conceptual apparatus of the physical sciences to social and psychological problems where the subject-matter is so much more mixed-up and undelimited. Dewey had, it seems to me, an opposite fault: he clung to the flux of fact with so much prudence that his ideas lacked keen edges and his prose was apt to be vague and hard to remember.

John Dewey

At any rate, he exercised as a teacher a cooling-down influence on my revolutionary ardor. It was not until years later, in the thirties, the Red Decade, when I was traveling toward an opposite conclusion, that he came out for a "socialized economy," and for "organized social control" as a means of supporting "the liberty of individuals." He was then seventy-eight years old, and I think his life-influence, taken as a whole, was in a contrary direction. He cared primarily about the liberty of individuals, and about democracy as conceived by idealistic Americans untouched by the Marxian mystique.

The Meaning of Pragmatism

Another mistake made by many of Dewey's conservative critics is to imagine that his pragmatism, or instrumental philosophy as he preferred to call it, is a glorification of America's tough-minded practicality as against the more subtle values called "spiritual" with which other philosophies have concerned themselves. Pragmatism does, to be sure, regard scientific method as a model of the method of all valid knowledge, and if one's conservatism involves a rejection of the authority of science, Dewey's instrumental interpretation goes by the board with it. But the feat accomplished by his interpretation is not to glorify, but to mitigate, the tough or narrow practicality—above all the materialism—of certain fanatic extroverts of what is called scientism. Pragmatism builds the needs and aspirations of man into the very process of acquiring knowledge, no matter how objective, no matter how "scientific" it may be.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The meaning of an idea, according to pragmatism, is its result in action, and the true idea is the idea that, acted upon, leads to the result indicated in its meaning.

William James, in his famous lectures on *Pragmatism* (which, by the way, I had the good fortune to attend), was naive enough to infer that this justified a belief in God. If the truth is what works, he said in effect, and it works to believe that God exists, then it is true that God exists. Dewey was miles away from this facile notion. He was, moreover, primarily concerned with morals rather than religion. His original motive, as he told me more than once, was not to glorify the authority of material science, but to give moral judgments a similar authority. It was, to employ once more the illuminating terms invented by James, a "tender-minded" rather than a "tough-minded" motive. Broadly enough interpreted, it remained an underlying motive in all his philosophizing, finding its concentrated expression, if anything Dewey wrote can be called concentrated, in a paper on "The Logical Conditions of a Scientific Treatment of Morality," to be found in the Publications of the University of Chicago for 1903.

I do not myself believe in the pragmatist definition of truth, either in the mature and cogent form in which Dewey elaborated it, or in the more naive manner in which William James abandoned himself to it. But I think many of his detractors on the so-called Right are making a total mistake when they dismiss pragmatism as a philosophic attack on the values called "spiritual." It would be truer to say, although the terms are far from technical, that pragmatism in all its forms is an effort to build spirituality into science.

A Liberator of Children

On the subject of education as well as philosophy, I think the reaction against John Dewey's theories has gone beyond reasonable bounds. Undoubtedly there has grown up, under the aegis of "progressive education," a generation of rude and ill-behaved youngsters, to whom a strict training in the amenities of life, a course of implacable instruction in reading, writing and arithmetic, and where indicated, an occasional sound spanking, would be, or would have been, an unmixed blessing. I think that an error, or a tacit assumption that is erroneous, underlies Dewey's educational theories which is to some extent responsible for this. But his insistence that children can and should be interested in what they do in school, and that discipline should be a demand that they carry through faithfully what they have set out spontaneously to do, rather than that

Max Eastman

they should do what some irrelevant ogre called "teacher" tells them to, was of immense benefit to civilization.

"A person who is trained to consider his actions, to undertake them deliberately, is in so far forth disciplined," Dewey wrote in *Democracy and Education.* "Add to this ability a power to endure in an intelligently chosen course in face of distraction, confusion, and difficulty, and you have the essence of discipline."

As a revolt against the previously prevailing notion that certain "subjects," in themselves "disciplinary," should be rammed into the brains of children at all cost to their own enterprise and adventure of living, this was a grand event. Dewey was really a liberator of children throughout the world, and as the quotation shows, liberating them did not mean letting them run wild. He was profoundly concerned, here as elsewhere, with morals. Just as in his philosophy he wanted to combine moral authority with the authority of science, so here he wanted to combine moral character and conduct with freedom of choice for the individual.

The erroneous assumption underlying his theories, as it seems to me, is that the spontaneous interests of the human cub are to be regarded, by and large, as acceptable. They are to be taken as the starting point of education. The idea of training or disciplining the *interests,* although it is one of the first things that has to be done with a baby, does not seem to find a place when the baby goes to a Dewey school. One of the things modern biology has taught us, is that none of our distinctively civilized attributes, either voluntary or intellectual, are transmitted in heredity to our children. A certain selective breeding no doubt takes place when men become civilized, but since no one has been able to plot the direction of it, it can be assumed that the babies born today do not differ on a large scale from those born thousands of years ago. Nature is not interested in modern improvements. A civilized human being is an artifact. To make one out of the little savages we are at birth requires a moulding of the impulses, not just of the efforts we make to fulfill them.

Really a Moderate

Probably Dewey has discussed this point somewhere and it has eluded my attention, but he failed, I feel sure, to give it the emphasis I think it needs. He was carried away by the role his philosophy gave to human purposes, not only in the development of knowledge, but in the very constitution of truth. He said to me once, speaking of the Dewey school in Chicago: "I was naive enough in those days to think of the school as an experimental proof of my philosophy." Remembering that surprising remark, I have fallen to wondering whether, without being any more naive, I might not regard the excesses to which the school has led as an experimental demonstration of the error in his philosophy. They both give too high and guiding a function to the offhand volitions of this, alas, very human animal.

I trust this remark does not place me among the reactionary martinets, who want to abandon the definition of education as growth under favorable conditions, who resent the world-rejoicing discovery that children can have fun going to school—it has rejuvenated the whole family from grandpa down—or begrudge John

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dewey his place among the immortal benefactors of the human race. Like most daring innovators, he went to extremes; a period of reaction, a dimming of his world-wide fame, was inevitable; but he will ride clear of that. And meanwhile those who imagine they are dancing at the funeral of another wild radical, will be surprised if they open a book and read a few lines actually written by him, how moderate he was, how cautious, how bent on conserving as well as multiplying the finest values of life in a free society.

John Dewey Pragmatically Tested

RUSSELL KIRK

It seems to me fair enough to judge a man and his works by that man's own standards. John Dewey's measure of all things was whether or not those things work in practice. So judged, the moral and educational and political philosophy of John Dewey—if, indeed, Instrumentalism is not merely the negation of philosophy—is false to the core. For it has failed catastrophically in this hard world of ours, and we stand perplexed amidst ruins. If practical success is the measure of truth—and so Dewey, in substance, declared—then Deweyism was a delusion through and through.

Mr. Max Eastman's mild defense of his old teacher and friend admits so many impeachments of Dewey's thought that I hesitate to break a butterfly on the wheel. John Dewey aspired to shape the destinies of nations: and shape this country's future he did, after an unpleasant fashion. For a man who intended—and in some sense, succeeded—to break down an order and substitute a new domination, I think a better apology is needed than merely the argument that, though wrongheaded in many matters, he was personally amiable and well-intentioned. We all know what Hell is paved with. If most of the mischief was done by Dewey's disciples, rather than by Dewey himself—well, according to the great Pragmatic Sanction, we must judge the truth of a principle by its consequences; and the worth of a theorist, I suppose, by the actions of his students.

Mr. Eastman's only very clear argument in support of his praise of Dewey as "among the immortal benefactors of the human race" is the implication that it was Dewey who made "the world-rejoicing discovery that children can have fun going to school—[which] has rejuvenated the whole family from grandpa down . . ." It seems to me, however, that this alleged modern discovery was known to good teachers from very early times indeed; all that the Deweyites have done is to carry it to excess. The fiction that all pre-Dewey schools were so many Dotheboys Halls has been widely promulgated by the Progressive Educationists; but nevertheless it is an historical falsehood. I myself went to an old-fashioned Michigan school with an old-fashioned superintendent, almost unaffected by Dewey's doctrines so late as 1936 (those notions have crept in since, sad to say); and the quantity of interest and enjoyment there, I venture to estimate, exceeded that of the average post-Dewey school.

Dr. Dewey and Mr. Eastman themselves went to old-fangled schools, I take it, and do not seem to have been permanently soured and disheartened by the experience. A perceptive friend of mine, a parent, calls the average American child of our time "bird-brained"—not that the average Progressively-schooled child is dimwitted, but that, bird-like, he flits impatiently from flower to flower, subject to subject, never pausing long enough really to understand or enjoy anything. This restless discontent, rather than true "fun," seems to me to be the product of Dewey's doctrine of child-interest. And as for gladdening the heart of grandpa by "fun in school," the grandpas I know seem more alarmed than heartened by the swaggering and bored rising generation.

Russell Kirk

Wrong on First Principles

For the rest, Mr. Eastman damns Dewey with faint praise—he wasn't a very thoroughgoing socialist, he had some concern for morals, he didn't really mean to abolish all discipline, and the rest. These negative virtues or small failings scarcely are the marks of a great philosopher. Mr. Eastman is willing enough to confess that Dewey's prose is turgid; and, as Mr. T. S. Eliot, Mr. Richard Weaver, and others have suggested, a man's style is a man's nature; and a fuzzy understanding is reflected in fuzzy writing. I do not think anyone is going to read Dewey fifty years from now; and I suspect that his very name, by that time, will be as vague and rather comical to scholars as Benjamin Kidd's, let us say, is to us nowadays.

For John Dewey went wrong on first principles—or rather, by denying the validity of first principles. Serving himself from the wisdom of our ancestors—from revelation, traditions, norms, and great imaginative literature—he was left with nothing better than a vague humanitarianism, which he endeavored to erect into a system of morals and politics—to con-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vert into a religion, indeed. The "Religious Humanist Manifesto" got up by Dewey and his friends was neither religious nor humanistic; but it was an attempt, as Mr. Eastman suggests, to make religion and morals "scientific"—by reducing them to the condition of mere social phenomena. In this, as in much else, he borrowed from Bentham and the Utilitarian school: as, indeed did Karl Marx. This Americanized Utilitarianism, which seems to be Mr. Eastman's own present creed (as expounded in *Reflections on the Failure of Socialism*) is, as Newman said, a philosophy of death; there is nothing in it to give men hope or comfort; and whatever ethical content it retains is no more than a vestige of the Christian morals from which it dissents. But the pretense that this utilitarian morality was somehow "practical," "realistic," and "useful" appealed to the American dislike for theory and for the supernatural which Tocqueville observed in the 1830's; and thus Deweyism gained, for the time, a hold which is only now relaxing.

Dullness and Prestige

It is Dewey's very dullness and lack of imagination, indeed, which chiefly has contributed toward his success with the dull and sterile clique of educationists who exert "the stranglehold on education." A real philosopher they could not understand; they could make nothing of a cultivated skeptic like Santayana, let alone a man of genius like Newman. A philosopher or philodoxer, I repeat, generally is justly measured by the quality of his disciples. Socrates attracted Plato; Cicero, the great jurisconsults; Burke, Coleridge; and Dewey—why, the intolerant knot of little-minded high-school principals who would ban from school libraries any popular magazine that ventures to suggest our schools may be imperfect. As madness often brings a temporary success in times of revolution, so dullness often carries with it some prestige in decades of smugness; and Dewey's American generation was wondrously smug, even when it tried to be revolutionary.

The dangerous emptiness of Dewey's system has been sufficiently criticized by Professor Eliseo Vivas. Here I venture only to suggest the fundamental misconceptions which insured that Dewey's own good-natured doctrines would pass into the keeping of "life adjustment" doctrinaires and "social reconstruction" ideologues. And it seems to me that Mr. Eastman, a man still better natured than his mentor, continues to subscribe to these doctrines: notions which, if generally triumphant in society, would utterly subvert the ideals of individuality, ordered freedom, and variety which Mr. Eastman inconsistently cherishes.

Three Illusions

The first illusion upon which I touch is the conviction of Dewey—and Eastman—that our received "religious notions" are "primitive mythology," to be beneficently supplanted by a new morality with the "authority of science." This is a remnant of what Dr. Eric Voegelin calls "the trauma of the Enlightenment," a vestigial eighteenth-century rationalism that Hume sufficiently undid nearly two centuries ago. St. Paul, St. Augustine, St. Thomas Aquinas, Bossuet, Samuel Johnson and John Henry Newman were not primitives. To presume that the physical and biological sciences, the creations—but the limited creations—of modern ingenuity, can operate in the realm of the transcendent is as shallow as to argue that the frescoes of Michelangelo can be sufficiently described by a chemical analysis of the paints he used. The "authority" of science is only the opinions of certain fallible students of science; and those students have changed their own opinions in their own special fields radically, again and again, within the present century. This is the "authority" of Dr. Alfred Kinsey to transfer taxonomic assumptions to human beings in the civil social order —to argue, with a wonderful naiveté, that law for snake and bee is law for man. There remains, of course, the word "science" in its larger meaning, as all systematic knowledge, of which theology is a part; but this science writ large is not what Dewey and Eastman have in mind. It is not "scientific" authority which endures. The authority of Socrates, a moralist, is valid still; but the authority of Newton, a scientist of genius, is pretty thoroughly shattered in our time. "To build spirituality into science" is lost endeavor, with the tools now at our disposal—the more so when a philosopher has only the foggiest notion of what "spirituality" means.

A second illusion is the tendency of Dewey, and of Eastman, to erect a mundane condition into an absolute; to seek some secular, immanent makeshift for religious belief; to substitute an institution for a truth. With Dewey, the substitute was Democracy; with Eastman, it now appears to be Capitalism. When the descriptive terms of politics or economics are elevated to the estate of god-terms, political and moral philosophy go out the window. Democracy and Capitalism are not absolutes; they are, at best, means to an end, and means with mingled virtues and vices. To be equal, or to be rich, is not the goal of human life. If means are treated as ends, thought and society fall into confusion. Such a state of affairs breeds the fanaticism of ideology. It is no accident that a collectivist like Professor Theodore Brameld is influenced by Dewey: this is the natural descent, the logical consequence, of "Progressive" educationist doctrines. For those doctrines are founded upon a fallacy. The true purpose of schooling is not to teach young people to "adjust to society" or to "adjust to life" or to "create a better world." The true purpose of formal education is to develop the truly human person, intellectually and ethically, for the private person's own sake.

A third illusion is the eagerness of Dewey—and, to a lesser extent, of Eastman—to cast aside theory, tradition, precedent, and history for the sake of experiment: to trust to a moment-to-moment, year-to-year pressing forward, in the expectation that something good is sure to come of Progress, and that any unpleasant consequences of the experiment may be written off as so many incidental slight errors, easily compensated for. This comes of the ingenuous transfer of laboratory techniques to the vast and unpredictable complex of human society, and entails perils of which, Mr. Eastman signifies, he has become somewhat aware.

Now the educational system of a people is a field in which this "Instrumentalism" is especially danger-

(*Continued on p. 23*)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Voluntary Taxation?

In last week's issue Mildred Adams McLearn held that compulsory taxation is incompatible with freedom. She proposed purely voluntary support of government, with disfranchisement for those unwilling to bear their proportional share of the cost. Below we publish comments on her article by four authorities

FELIX MORLEY
MURRAY N. ROTHBARD
HENRY HAZLITT
FRANK CHODOROV

False Premise: Distorted Conclusions

There is one serious defect in the logic of Mrs. McLearn's thought-provoking argument for voluntary self-taxation. She assumes that the Russian political system and that of the United States are clear-cut opposites, and that "our basic principle" is as individualistic as that of socialism is collectivist. That is not true. As the result of a false premise, distortion naturally creeps into the conclusions. Fortunately this can be remedied, which should be done because of the basic value in her suggestion.

The political opposite of socialism is anarchy. Our federal system of doubly divided and balanced governmental powers may fairly be called a golden mean between these two extremes. Since it is a middle-of-the-road system it would be wholly natural to defend it by the "middle-of-the-road ideas and policies" which Mrs. McLearn decries. The trouble is that our governmental reaction to the socialist challenge is not medial, but definitely socialistic. We pay the Kremlin the sincerest form of flattery by imitating its techniques of centralization, albeit reluctantly and therefore inefficiently. One could wish that the rivalry between Washington and Moscow were really essentially one of political ideology, and less comparable with the age-old antagonisms of concentrated national power. In that case we would not be witnessing the growing neutralism which says: "a plague on both your houses."

Your correspondent's primary fallacy leads directly to that which follows, in the assertion that ". . . a fatal flaw in the Constitution . . . was forced taxation." The Founding Fathers certainly did not believe that compulsory taxation, when duly circumscribed by the Constitution as a whole, is tyranny. On the contrary, both the debates of the Philadelphia Convention, so far as recorded, and the Federalist Papers are filled with the sharpest criticism of the original Confederation's lack of coercive power in applying what Alexander Hamilton charmingly described as "pecuniary mulcts." In 1787 practically every American realized, as one would also assume for 1958, that a government without some coercive taxing power is simply not a government. As James Madison summed it up, in No. 41 of *The Federalist:*

> The power of levying and borrowing money . . . has been examined already with much attention, and has, I trust, been clearly shown to be necessary, both in the extent and form given to it by the Constitution.

What the Founding Fathers did not anticipate, and what I infer is the real target at which Mrs. McLearn is aiming, is "the power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived," as given to the Congress by adoption of the Sixteenth Amendment. Aside from customs duties, which are of course a form of forced taxation, the sales tax was the revenue device most favored by those who wrote the Constitution and, be it noted, for much the same reasons of voluntarism now advanced by Mrs. McLearn. Hamilton—no mean authority in the field of taxation—put it cogently in No. 21 of *The Federalist:*

> Imposts, excises, and, in general, all duties upon articles of consumption, may be compared to a fluid, which will, in time, find its level with the means of paying them. The amount to be contributed by each citizen will in a degree be at his own option, and can be regulated by an attention to his resources. The rich may be extravagant, the poor can be frugal; and private oppression may always be avoided by a judicious selection of objects proper for such impositions.

Income Tax Inequitable

One gathers, though it is not made wholly clear, that the essential part of Mrs. McLearn's suggestion is to link not *all* taxation, but rather the income tax alone, to the franchise. That is a fruitful line of thinking and one which would accord with both the letter and spirit of the Constitution. Also, it is far more rational than the argument that since we conscript boys for military service at age 18, the voting age should be lowered to that level, as Georgia has done. On the one hand, this provides no check to the arbitrary use of governmental power, while on the other it further minimizes that mature responsibility which, as Mrs. McLearn rightly emphasizes, should be an inseparable attribute of citizenship.

Your correspondent intimates, but again rather hazily, that the registered taxpayer might vote (and therefore pay income tax) on either

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the local or the national basis. This idea richly merits development. One may readily picture many constitutionally-minded Americans who would voluntarily pay their state, but not a national, income tax—quite irrespective of the amounts involved. A poll of NATIONAL REVIEW readers on this particular point would be illuminating.

On this vital matter of local self-government, exception must be taken to the unjustified assertion that "the cities have always been among the most corrupt establishments in America." If it sometimes looks that way, this is primarily because corruption in local government cannot be indefinitely concealed, while that in the national bureaucracy, in effect defended by paid "public relations" officers, and remote from public oversight, may easily go wholly undisclosed.

This is not the only instance in which it is necessary to defend your correspondent's thesis against herself. Clearly it is the iniquitous national income tax, rather than compulsory taxation as such, at which she is hitting. For instance, she never even suggests making the payment of the tariff tax a voluntary matter. But on the issue of the national income tax, Mrs. McLearn's feet are on firm ground. Both its so-called "progressive" feature and the double taxation of profits which it takes, are thoroughly inequitable and certainly would have been condemned by the Founding Fathers.

Finally, it is only the national income tax which can be used, as it is now being suicidally used by seemingly patriotic Americans, as a socialistic weapon to destroy the free enterprise system. Karl Marx saw that, and said so more directly than Mrs. McLearn has done.

FELIX MORLEY

In a Glorious—and Radical—Tradition

Hosannahs are in order for Mrs. McLearn, and for NATIONAL REVIEW's courage in printing her article. The revolutionary concept of voluntary contributions to government has acquired substantial support in libertarian circles, but this is perhaps the first time it has come into public view as a serious proposal. In this respect, it renews a shortlived but glorious tradition that flourished in the great individualist age of the late nineteenth century. There were glimmerings of the pure voluntarist idea in the early writings of Johann Fichte, but perhaps its first positive expression came at a meeting of the great Political Economy Club in 1849, when the veteran French libertarian economists Frédéric Bastiat and Charles Dunoyer were shocked to find their young disciple, Gustave de Molinari, going beyond them to reject taxation altogether. Molinari, who lived to a remarkable old age as the *doyen* of French economists, can be found in English translation in his fine but neglected work, *The Society of Tomorrow* (1904). The other great figure of the past is Auberon Herbert, a British aristocrat and former M. P., converted to liberty by Herbert Spencer. Herbert soon went beyond his master to advocate voluntary taxation and to found a movement called Voluntaryism. Herbert died suddenly in 1906, on the point of distributing a Plea for Voluntaryism as a nation-wide petition. World War I killed the Voluntaryist movement as it did so many other aspects of liberty, and it is only recently that these ideas have been brewing again.

Would It Work?

I mention this history briefly, because anyone who has flirted with the question of voluntary taxation has had to face inevitably the charge that he is indeed halfway round the bend. Yet it is interesting to note that critics have all too quickly dismissed the idea as lunatic, without first bothering to say whether such a system would be desirable. In short, we must separate the question: would voluntary contributions be desirable, and could such a scheme work? Those who wish to preserve taxation as a means of looting Peter to pay Paul will of course reject the whole idea out of hand. But it is not for them that Mrs. McLearn wrote her pioneering article; she wrote for those who want liberty and ask: could it work?

The most common complaint is that voluntaryists believe, charmingly but naively, that all men are good; if they only understood man's capacity for evil, they would have to favor taxation. But few if any voluntaryists have really been so unworldly. On the contrary, they believe quite sensibly that man has a great capacity for both good and evil. That is precisely why they maintain that taxation must be abolished: for the existence of compulsory taxation provides a legalized channel for crime. The purpose of voluntaryism is to erect a system where crime and coercion have no legal and legitimate rationale: where robbery and murder would always be regarded and punished as crimes, and never glorified as necessary for the "social good." Only the abolition of taxation leaves no legal loophole for aggression. If men are capable of great evil, shall we put into the hands of any group of men a monopoly of power to coerce their fellows?

Private vs. State Services

My major criticism of Mrs. McLearn's article is that she does not quite realize how radical this proposal really is. Even semantically, the very term "voluntary taxation" strikes me as a contradiction. The very essence of taxation is compulsion, so that it would be more appropriate to contrast "voluntary payments to government" with "taxation." But there are far more important problems of neglected radicalism. For the crucial question is this: why shouldn't Mrs. McLearn's non-voter have the right to turn to some other agency for protection or other services now supplied by the government? And if he does have this right, as he must in a truly voluntary society, what becomes of the very concept of government as an agency with a monopoly of force? Instead of "a government" there would be a truly free market, with private firms supplying all services, whether they are now branded as "governmental" or not. For a service is now called "governmental" only because it is currently supplied by the coercive monopoly of government.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An important and neglected fact is that *every one* of the services now considered uniquely and necessarily governmental or coercive, *e.g.*, fire-fighting, post office, dams, roads, police protection, judicial service, etc., has at one time or another been successfully supplied by private enterprise. Eliminate coercion of peaceful citizens, and they would be so supplied again.

Mrs. McLearn's proposed "government" would, in fact, become an inefficient consumer cooperative, struggling vainly to compete with private corporations, whatever its chosen field of service. I call it a consumer cooperative because every customer would have an equal vote in electing the "directors" of the enterprise. Subject to free competition, it would be hopelessly inefficient and wither away, for a) consumer cooperatives lack the investment incentives provided by equity ownership in corporate enterprise; b) it would dispense its services to *non*-customers and customers alike; and c) it would charge each customer a uniform percentage of his income. Contrast almost any free market firm, which charges every customer, rich or poor, a uniform price for its service. Would the wealthier consumers continue to buy from an agency that soaked the rich man more than the poor man for the same service?

Anarchism?

Another prime reason for the inefficiency of all government operation is the inherent split between benefit and payment: those who pay are unrelated to those who reap the benefits. Mrs. McLearn would retain this cleavage, relying only on a loss of voting power to induce a man to pay. But it is one of the peculiarly great problems of any democracy that it functions as a giant consumer cooperative, the shares of which can neither be sold nor pay a dividend. In such a system, the power to vote means nothing to any man. Of what use is anyone's one-sixty-millionth power to affect a political decision? But a man's choice of buying or not buying services on the free market *is* meaningful to him, and whatever the good or service sold, he always has this choice.

There will be those who charge that some or all of Mrs. McLearn's or my discussion adds up simply to "anarchy." Unless we are to adopt Karl Marx's sneer at the free market as "anarchy of production," we had better guard our semantic front. For the term "anarchism" has become almost as confused as the term "liberal," and the professed anarchists of our century have all been even more violently opposed to capitalism and private property than have the Communists. Voluntaryism in any of its forms, on the other hand, would finally render private property inviolate. Is this anarchism?

In conclusion, we must all be deeply grateful to Mrs. McLearn for bravely launching us on a new and virgin field of study: how to eradicate the legal initiation of force and violence in our society. Those who scoff at the ideas suggested as absurd and impractical are cordially invited to set to work and come up with practical proposals of their own. Certainly, if only a fraction of the energy so far devoted to plans for pushing people around, were expended on proposals for liberty, the world would be a far better place in which to live.

MURRAY N. ROTHBARD

Coercive, Yes; Confiscatory, No

Mildred Adams McLearn is not the first, of course, to suggest that tax payment should be purely "voluntary"; but she deserves praise for her effort to deal candidly with some of the problems that voluntary taxation would involve. Let us see whether that effort is successful.

Nearly every government in the world today unduly limits the liberty of the individual, prohibits actions it ought not to prohibit, compels actions it ought not to compel, imposes burdensome, unjust and punitive taxes, deters enterprise, and, in brief, exercises too much power and coercion.

But it does not follow that all coercion is evil and unnecessary. No government could exist without some powers of coercion. To govern is, by definition, at least partly to coerce. Government must use coercion to prevent coercion. None of us could enjoy liberty unless others were prevented from interfering in our peaceable pursuit of liberty. Peace and order cannot exist unless the majority is able to prevent unscrupulous minorities or individuals from destroying peace and order. Government exists precisely to preserve peace and order. Its function is to safeguard the private property, life and liberty of every citizen. It must establish a system of law. It must enforce obedience to law. It must employ policemen to protect its citizens from internal aggression and it must employ armed forces to protect its citizens from external aggression. The agents of the State must be the *only* persons authorized to exercise coercion—a strictly limited coercion. And as part of its essential function, the State must be authorized to levy compulsory taxes.

Make Taxes Equitable

What is chiefly important is not that taxes should be voluntary (a quite impracticable aim), but that they should be equitable, and offer a minimum deterrence to enterprise and production.

Adam Smith thought the most equitable principle for imposing taxes on individuals was "in proportion to their respective abilities; that is, in proportion to the revenue which they respectively enjoy." But in recent times this "ability-to-pay" principle has been perverted to mean, not taxes directly proportioned to the individual's income, but "progressive" taxes which take a constantly greater proportion of an individual's income as that income increases. Most of the arguments used to support the "graduated" or "progressive" income tax, if carried to their logical conclusion, would lead to complete confiscation of all income above that needed for the individual's survival. And, in fact, a personal income tax rising to 91 per cent falls short of confiscation in a merely technical sense.

What Mrs. McLearn has in mind is a tax directly proportional to income. But it is difficult to see how this could be made purely voluntary.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If C refused to pay his just share of the tax this year, and went unpenalized, A and B would probably refuse next year. Mrs. McLearn proposes that each man reveal and declare his own income. What assurance would the State have that he was telling the truth? It would have to use the same coercive powers of investigation that it uses at present. Under Mrs. McLearn's plan, the only punishment the State could inflict, if it found that a man was not telling the truth about his income, or even if he flatly refused to pay any tax at all, would be to deprive him of his vote. But suppose some rich men, or suppose even the majority of all the citizens, preferred not voting to paying their "voluntary" income tax? Whoever refused to pay would of course lose the right to vote, for whatever that might be worth to him. But he would still get the benefit of police protection, fire protection, sanitary protection, and security from foreign attack, for the simple reason that there is no practicable way in which the State can give such protections to anybody without giving them to everybody.

Henry Thoreau's failure to recognize this was the fallacy behind his refusal to pay his poll tax. For here the analogy between the State and a voluntary organization breaks down. The individual has the right to become a member of a private organization or not, as he sees fit. If he does not wish the benefits or alleged benefits, he need not join. (Not true today, alas, of labor unions.) But if we wished to deny the individual the benefits of good government toward which he refused to contribute, we should find it a little inconvenient to deport him. In fact, we should have to use coercion.

Right on Two Counts

On two important points, Mrs. McLearn is solidly right. No one who fails to pay any taxes whatever, and particularly no one who lives chiefly on the taxes paid by others, should have the right to vote. As John Stuart Mill pointed out in his *Representative Government:*

> The assembly which votes the taxes, either general or local, should be elected exclusively by those who pay something toward the taxes imposed. Those who pay no taxes, disposing by their votes of other people's money, have every motive to be lavish and none to economize. As far as money matters are concerned, any power of voting possessed by them is a violation of the fundamentals of free government; a severance of the power of control from the interest in its beneficial exercise. It amounts to allowing them to put their hands into other people's pockets for any purpose which they think fit to call a public one. . . . Representation should be co-extensive with taxation.

The second principle Mrs. McLearn rightly emphasizes is that any taxation of income should be flatly proportional, not progressive. As F. A. Hayek has put it: "Once it is admitted that it is right that a majority impose a heavier proportional burden on a minority, there seems to be no limits to the length to which this will be carried."

If we could establish these two principles—the limitation of the right to vote to those who pay direct taxes, however low, and the establishment of strictly proportional taxation of incomes—we would secure the essential guarantees of liberty, private property, free enterprise, and government economy that Mrs. McLearn so rightly seeks.

HENRY HAZLITT

Why Take the Long Way 'Round?

What Mrs. McLearn proposes is not a system of taxation, but rather a system of self-tithing. All taxes are, by definition, compulsory charges n the citizens for the expenses of state. However, that is unimportant.

Putting aside the fact that her proposal is visionary—what's wrong with being visionary?—the fact is that her scheme would just about deprive the political establishment of enough revenue to keep in business. For, if I know anything about human behavior, I would guess that most people do not put a high worth on the right of suffrage; not high enough to give up, say, 20 per cent of their income. Even a poll tax of a couple of dollars has kept many voters from casting their ballots.

Are People Ready?

This is not an objection to the idea. But, for her idea to get any acceptance, people would have to realize that this is the way to indicate their opinion of the State, namely: that it is worthless. I don't believe they are ready for that. While they are averse to paying taxes or contributing anything to the expenses of the political establishment, they still want something for nothing, *via* social security, unemployment insurance, TVA, farm relief, and so on, believing that somebody else is footing the bill.

Her idea is based on the assumption that people would voluntarily pay for government services. This might be true on a local level, where the services are visible and directly conducive to their well-being; like sewers, schools, traffic cops, etc. But they are not interested enough in foreign affairs to pay Harold Stassen's salary or to maintain a diplomatic mission in Moscow. Even California is of little concern to New Yorkers. Maybe we are a politically mature people; but are we mature enough to make voluntary contributions for the maintenance of a political establishment far removed from our daily lives? I doubt it. I rather think that even the readers of public-opinion magazines would falsify their income tax returns so that they could register their political opinions at the least possible cost.

Mrs. McLearn's opening argument is quite correct: that our liberty is threatened by State interventionism. She does not say so, but the implication is clear that this interventionism is made possible by taxation. Why not, then, keep the State in line by simply curtailing its power of taxation? Why not abolish the Sixteenth Amendment and be done with it? Or, there is the Bracken Lee proposal (taken from the Articles of Confederation) that the central government levy on each state according to its population; this would give the states some control over how the people's money should be spent.

FRANK CHODOROV

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Letter from London

ANTHONY LEJEUNE

The Old Familiar Paces

The current issue of a magazine published by the Union of Post Office Workers contains an interesting article on "Socialism in the United States." The author tells us that, though at first sight the socialist movement seems to have made little headway in the United States, we need not despair. Socialist ideas have been creeping in under other names and within fifty years America may be a socialist country without knowing it.

Just over a year ago I remarked in these columns on the alarming similarity between what was being written about inflation in American papers and what was being written about inflation in British papers a few years earlier. Like our friend in the Post Office, I began to wonder whether contemporary political trends on either side of the Atlantic may not be a good deal more alike than people are apt to imagine. In a divided world Britain and America face the same great moral and strategic problems; but they also share more insidious domestic problems.

Inflation—a Weapon

Each day's newspapers produce instructive points of comparison. It is surely still true, for instance, that in spite of the recession, inflation remains the real economic problem on both sides of the Atlantic. Our two governments have belatedly and somewhat lethargically tried to deal with it, but as soon as their attempts to check inflation begin to bite, they grew scared at the cries of indignation and let the reins go again. Not everyone dislikes inflation. Organized labor usually profits by it; left-wing economists approve of it in moderation; and egalitarians recognize it as their sharpest weapon.

Spurred by desperation rather than courage, the British Government has been obstinately resisting further inflation since last autumn. The outcry from the unions and the Labor Party has been terrific; a series of accumulated wage-claims is beginning to burst upon us. The first was the London busmen's claim. Then came a much more serious challenge from the railways. In their case, the tribunal said there was no money for any wage increase at all. The railwaymen adopted militant attitudes; their leaders went to see the Prime Minister and the Minister of Labor; they threatened a national railway strike. This threat has now been withdrawn, for the very good reason that from the end of June they are to receive a 3 per cent wage increase.

The Government and the railway unions are busy congratulating each other on having been so reasonable and statesmanlike: the public is relieved to know there won't be a strike; but the Conservative backbenchers, led by Mr. Thorneycroft, the economists who still believe in sound money, and those ordinary people who had been cherishing a wild hope that the Government might really be able to stop inflation are none of them at all happy. It is hard to feel confident that the pattern of a 3 per cent wage rise will not assert itself, with the familiar inflationary result, over the entire industrial structure.

"Witchhunt" in Schools

The local council elections which have been taking place during the past few weeks have shown a steady swing away from the Conservative Party. One of the first practical consequences was a decision by the new Socialist majority on the Middlesex County Council to remove the ban which prevented Communists and Fascists from becoming headmasters of Middlesex schools. This ban, say the Socialists, was imposed by the Tories in the "witchhunt" mood of 1950. It has been constantly attacked by teachers' associations and its removal will doubtless be hailed as a victory for freedom. Some headmasters, we are told, have been going to other countries rather than "endure" the kind of interrogation which Middlesex imposed on them. I can't myself remember a "witchhunt" mood in 1950, a year when Burgess and Maclean were both happily ensconced in the Foreign Office, nor do I see what has happened since then to make Communist teachers less dangerous; but I do seem to have heard some very similar arguments on the other side of the Atlantic.

Paradoxically, the same woolly-minded Liberals who object so strongly to "interference" of this kind are usually the first to clamor for Government interference in all sorts of other matters. They cry out for more planning and subsidies, which mean more regulations and taxes. They want the government to interfere very widely in industry and are furious when it stops interfering between landlord and tenant. Many of them want the government to interfere with private schools in the conclusive sense of closing them down. Don't these woolly-minded Liberals have like-minded cousins in America?

All of them, of course, believe in taxing their fellow citizens to provide large quantities of aid for the "underdeveloped countries." There has been a good deal of ironic sympathy for Mr. Nixon's recent misadventures in Latin America. Britain is accustomed to seeing her emissaries reviled and pelted with stones by the people she has been trying to help. It is something to which America may also grow accustomed.

These similarities and common perils are not always brought out adequately in the press because of a final and rather remarkable similarity: newspapers both in Britain and America tend to be owned by Right-wing proprietors but written by Left-inclined journalists. It is the business of conservatives, however, to notice them and to fight against them. We shall be told that we are fighting against the spirit of the times, a hopeless task: but if that is so—and I'm not sure it is—I would still hold with Robert Frost that it is never less than treason "to go with the drift of things" when the drift is in the wrong direction.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Lincoln-Douglas Debates

RICHARD M. WEAVER

Just one hundred years ago Abraham Lincoln and Stephen A. Douglas were stumping Illinois for the office of United States Senator. They made a total of eighty-three appearances before the voters of that state, seven of which were in the form of joint debates. Now, on this anniversary of that famous contest, the University of Chicago Press has performed a service in bringing these debates to the public in a new and scholarly edition, *Created Equal? The Complete Lincoln-Douglas Debates of 1858* ($7.50). In addition to complete texts, the volume contains an introduction by its editor, Paul M. Angle, and many illuminating sidelights from newspaper accounts of the time.

The prospective reader should be cautioned, however, not to raise his expectations too high. Despite the important place they hold in American political history, these clashes are not of uniformly high forensic quality. A large amount of time was taken up with incrimination and recrimination. Each candidate charged the other with being party to a "conspiracy." Lincoln claimed that Douglas had entered into a conspiracy to make the institution of slavery national, by inserting a provision in the "Nebraska Bill" which would remove the restriction imposed by the Missouri Compromise and eventually make it unconstitutional for any state to prohibit slavery. Douglas claimed that Lincoln had entered into a conspiracy with certain leaders to dissolve the old Party and the Democratic Party by "abolitionizing" them, in return for which he was to get a seat in the Senate. These charges were aired and parried at nearly every meeting.

There is no doubt, however, about the real issue, which was what to do about slavery. And though he won the election, there is no doubt that Douglas got the worst of the argument. In the final debate he was reduced to the demagoguery of attacking Lincoln's record in Congress on the Mexican War ten years earlier. In intellect Douglas was not even a little giant. Lincoln, on the other hand, was a master of argument, and his method was one that Douglas was peculiarly unfitted to cope with.

I would suggest that it is from the methods of the two men that the philosophic historian and the student of public affairs can learn most. It is apparent from the first that Lincoln was primarily a dialectician, engaged in trying to define certain terms. Douglas was replying to him as a rhetorician, and a rather poor one at that. In this role Douglas allowed himself to be caught doing one thing which the student of logic or any person with a good logical mind is most studious to avoid: he allowed himself to be caught playing around in the excluded middle.

The law of logic says that between two contradictories there is no middle ground. And Douglas kept trying to steer away from any commitment. The question was: what is the Negro? Is he a man? Is he a slave? Is he a free and equal citizen? Douglas would never say. As far as argument goes, any one of these alternatives would have been better than the position he took, which was that every state and territory had the right to answer the question in its own way, and that there the matter must rest. The nature of the Negro was therefore for him purely a matter of political determination.

Lincoln, on the contrary, took a stand, though it was a very limited one, and I do not doubt that many of his admirers will be surprised to learn how conservative he was on the race question. In replying to Douglas in the debate at Ottawa, he declared: "I have no purpose to introduce political and social equality between the white and black races. There is a physical difference between the two which in my judgment will probably forever forbid their living together upon the footing of perfect equality, and inasmuch as it becomes a necessity that there must be a difference, I, as well as Judge Douglas, am in favor of the race to which I belong having the superior position." Earlier in a speech at Springfield he had said: "What I would most desire would be a separation of the white and black races."

Lincoln's definition was simply that the Negro was a creature entitled to the fruits of his own toil. That, he argued insistently, was the definition implied by the Declaration of Independence, and his object was to place slavery where he thought the Founders of the Republic had placed it, namely, in a position pointing toward ultimate extinction.

SINCE Lincoln was willing to say what he thought the Negro was, and Douglas was not, the argument as argument could have but one outcome. Minimal as his definition was, it gave Lincoln a position from which he could attack and defend. Douglas had no defense except rhetorical appeals to a vague abstraction called "popular sovereignty" and to the prestige of the Supreme Court, which had just handed down the Dred Scott decision. The apostrophes of Douglas to this as "the law of the land," to be regarded as final and unquestionable, sound curiously like those being used today to protect the "desegregation" order from attack. Lincoln had no such reverence for this "law of the land" and said expressly that he expected to get it changed. "Somebody has to reverse that decision,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

since it is made, and we mean to reverse it," he asserted.

Lincoln did provide Douglas with one opening which the latter exploited with a degree of success. This was his famous statement to the effect that a house divided against itself cannot stand. Douglas was quick, if not very skillful, in pointing out that such doctrine, if pushed to its logical limit, is the principle of despotic government. "Uniformity is the parent of despotism the world over, not only in politics but in religion," he answered. Lincoln had to spend a lot of time in subsequent speeches digging himself out of that one, explaining that "it would be foolish for us to insist on having a cranberry law here in Illinois, where we have no cranberries, because they have a cranberry law in Indiana, where they have cranberries."

The issue was a potent one, of course, because it involves the idea of nationalization and the extent to which a state composed of many units should centralize its laws. Despite his disclaimer, Lincoln never made a very convincing case for states' rights. Douglas, on the other hand, never sounded very convincing in his real or pretended moral indifference to slavery, which he expressed by saying that he did not care whether slavery "was voted up or voted down." And furthermore Lincoln was protected by the very limited claim he made for the Negro, which would allow the states to make about any regulations for him they chose as long as his bondage was removed.

No case of course is a hundred per cent one way, and if Lincoln was the better controversialist, Douglas was the better prophet. I believe, moreover, that these facts are very closely related to their respective characters as dialectician and rhetorician. It is the work of the dialectician to form definitions and to work out their logical implications. It is the work of the rhetorician to take cognizance of prevailing values and of the urgency of historical forces. Douglas had said in a speech at Chicago: "Mr. Lincoln advocates boldly and clearly a war of sections, a war of the North against the South, of the free states against the slave states —a war of extermination—to be conducted relentlessly until one or the other shall be subdued. . . ." Lincoln said that anything like that was very far from his conception. Yet it was only a few years until the prophecy was fulfilled. If Lincoln was the better logician, Douglas had the better intuition of the situation.

What if Lincoln had been opposed then and in 1860 not by a third-rate rhetorician, but by a great one (who must by definition be also a pretty fair dialectician)? What if he had been opposed by someone of the caliber of Patrick Henry or Daniel Webster, who might have realized for the people with irresistible vividness the danger in the explosive forces which had built up? It is only speculation, but Lincoln might have polled considerably less than the forty per cent of the vote he received nationally, and the United States might have missed having its most mythogenic president.

Half-Gods of American Literature

RICHARD McLAUGHLIN

THE STAGGERING amount of literary exegesis published in recent years in which Hawthorne, Poe and Melville are the targets of a barrage of Freudo-Marxist interpretation poses a very serious problem. This form of critical analysis has become a menace to clear thinking; it is not only dangerously deceptive in phraseology but it distorts our understanding of American traditions.

Fortunately, *American Classics Reconsidered* (Scribner, $4.95)—a volume of essays about Emerson, Cooper, Brownson, Hawthorne, Longfellow, Poe, Thoreau, Melville, Whitman, and the literary historians, Bancroft, Motley, Parkman and Prescott—has no other aim than to give a "Christian appraisal" of these nineteenth-century writers. Compiled and edited by Harold C. Gardiner, S. J. (Father Gardiner is Literary Editor of *America*) this collection is, like most miscellanies of this nature, somewhat repetitious and of mixed quality, the text and texture of these different scholars ranging anywhere from brilliant to pedestrian. It is indeed too bad that Father Gardiner's own authoritative introductory essay does not set the tone for all the essays which follow. However, the general tone of the anthology is a healthy one—far healthier than the tone of Harry Levin's arbitrary study of Hawthorne, Poe and Melville, *The Power of Blackness* (Knopf, $4.00).

Mr. Levin, who served his apprenticeship under the late F. O. Matthiessen, is obviously dedicated to putting a gloomy and negative complexion on our culture. Bent on assembling what he calls "a literary iconology," Levin contends, like Charles Feidelson in his recent book, *Symbolism and American Literature,* that symbolism was a point of view, not just a technique, in the central body of the writings of all three writers, Hawthorne, Poe and Melville. Painstakingly examining Hawthorne's historical consciousness, Poe's analytic rigor and Melville's archetypal imagery, Mr. Levin endeavors to illustrate by quoting freely from their works how pervasively they were obsessed by the "power of blackness." About all I can say to all this is that the students out at Berkeley—the lectures which make up the present volume were delivered at the University of California during the spring semester of 1957—must have had a grisly time of it. And I don't know that I blame them if they never pick up a volume of any of the "transcendentalists," preferring to keep their sanity and peace of mind.

But if they weren't scared out of their wits, in addition to being hopelessly depressed to find so much nihilism and futility on the nineteenth-century New England landscape, they must have received a terrible shock, as this reader did, to learn that our great prose masters were also trail-blazers for the doctrines of Karl Marx, Lenin and the twentieth-century existentialists. On page 80, in the middle of a detailed analysis of Hawthorne's *The House of the Seven Gables,* I was startled to read the following:

> Sins of fathers visited on children, love of money as the root of evil—such assumptions are of Biblical orthodoxy. But, more immediately be-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hind Hawthorne's book, there is also a decade of intensive radicalism, an international discussion of the question "What is Property?" which the socialist Proudhon succinctly answered, "Theft." Hawthorne itemizes that sweeping indictment. All his misgivings over the dead hand of the past, in this context, register as protests against inherited ownership. He even entertains the hypothesis that the original sin may be capitalism.

This is sheer nonsense. Frankly, Clifford Pyncheon's declaration: "What we call real estate—the solid ground to build a house on—is the broad foundation on which nearly all the guilt of this world rests," cannot be reduced to this. Hawthorne's metaphysical view, his deeply reflective nature, his continual preoccupation with morality, rule out any frontal attack on property ownership. His stress is upon the life of the spirit as opposed to vanity and pride connected with material things.

Mr. Levin's central theme of dark possession is strongly refuted by Father Gardiner when he maintains, along with Joseph Schwartz who contributed the essay on Hawthorne to the symposium, that Hawthorne turned his back on the "puritan theocracy" of his ancestors. And though Melville thought Hawthorne was great because of the "power of darkness in him," the truth of the matter is that Hawthorne could not have possibly subscribed to the Calvinistic doctrine of human nature's innate depravity because of his "insistence on the cause and cure of sin in the individual heart."

Oddly enough, both Mr. Levin and Father Gardiner agree on one thing. In trying to suggest the continuity of some kind of American literary heritage, they pick William Faulkner as the only likely successor to the nineteenth-century "half-gods in American literature." Mr. Levin sees a marked resemblance between Faulkner and his fellow Southerner Edgar Allan Poe, stating that Faulkner "is less concerned with regional traits than with universal passions." Father Gardiner goes even further. Dismayed by the onset of realism, by the novel's gradual decline to a "too-photographic recording of social stresses and a worried interest in environment," he places his faith in Faulkner's rich, broad imagination, if not in his subject matter.

Movies

A Movie for Grownups

JAMES BURNHAM

Works of art have a wonderful way of upsetting theories about art. A theory, after all, is a kind of intellectual cage into which the mind tries to lock unruly facts. But a work of art, a genuine work, is sly enough to squeeze through any bars.

I find the movies so entrancing a medium and their usual content such drivel that my movie-theory has gradually adapted itself to my taste. Granted the space-time limit, the corporate mode of production and the necessarily mass audience—I will argue—a movie should be a kind of formal pantomime, a cinematic *commedia dell' arte*, without any attempt at subtleties of character or idea. The joy is in the moving camera, the represented surface of the world, the visual and aural counterpoint. Don't let the movie bog down into the photographing of what is really a play or the transcription of what is really a novel; let the camera get out of doors as much as possible, so that the movie does what no other form of art can; keep the characters and plot formal, conventional, because otherwise they will turn into pretentious platitudes. In short, my ideal movie is a good Western.

Claude Autant-Lara's *Rouge et Noir* violates nearly all of my rules, with the happiest results. So it may not be necessary to settle, once for all, for Westerns plus an occasional *Around the World in 80 Days*. Without ever confusing his cinematic medium with the intrinsically different medium of the novel, Autant-Lara has made a new work that need not blush when it is mentioned in the same discourse as Stendhal's complex masterpiece which is its point of departure. Necessarily the characters are simplified in the movie, but they remain much more than psychological stereotypes. The plot is properly stylized, but the red and black threads are still woven.

There are no "natural" or panoramic outdoor shots. Except for a few formalized scenes in front of houses or in gardens, Autant-Lara sticks to interiors. Many of these, in color harmonies composed with wit and a painter's rather than a photographer's imagination, are extraordinarily handsome; indeed, some of the furniture and furnishings are quite the most handsome I can remember seeing in any movie. This impression is secured by selection, not at all by the standard commercial method of piling things on. The aristocratic elegance of the house of the Marquis de la Mole, like that of the Marquis himself as perfectly played by Jean Mercure, is affirmed not by showing vast rooms, hundreds of people and thousands of things, but by focusing on the precise few that will signify the whole.

Stendhal's book seems to suspend in synthetic ambiguity a dozen simultaneous meanings. Not all of these could be preserved outside the realm of words, but Autant-Lara, though he very rightly made the personal dominant, has not omitted a satirical and social dimension. Going from the provincial home of M. de Renal to the seminary of the Abbé Pirard to the Parisian mansion of the Marquis de la Mole, Julien Sorel—in which part Gérard Philipe is in looks and manner just as he should be—is also moving through Bourgeoisie, Church and Aristocracy. The class as well as the individual definitions of the three places are translated into the visual language of the camera. And Julien himself, though he is mushed up a bit in a sentimentalized ending that omits—as it would surely have to do—Stendhal's final touch of the Grand Guignol, is compounded before our eyes of romantic passion and introspection, a drive that is half vulgar social climbing and half Bonapartist ambition, together with a strong dash of the "modern man" style of "emancipation."

As for the passion, Autant-Lara ends by dropping the irony that is always latent in the novel. The movie keeps a good deal of the romantic posturings and claptrap—ladders at the window, whispers and assigna-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions—but it goes on to carry both of Julien's affairs to a serious and unaccustomed depth. We are not used to adult passion in the movies, and we almost forget how little its expression need have to do with billowing bosoms, pruriently exposed flesh and swaying buttocks. The intensely divided—and incurably plebeian—Julien Sorel is not capable of being the active subject of serious passion, but he becomes, twice over, its object.

Mme. de Renal (Danielle Darrieux) is a narrow, husband-and-conscience-bound provincial bourgeoise; Mathilde de la Mole (Antonella Lualdi) is gilded with the automatic conceit of birth, beauty and intelligence; but both are seized by the wild current. By two shocking but entirely convincing visual symbols that are in that intimate boundary between true art and the grotesque, Autant-Lara externalizes the passion's depth in the terms of his medium: when Mathilde in her bedroom with Julien, called to go to Mass with her family, clips off a gaping handful of her hair to fling at her lover; and when Mme. de Renal, beside Julien's crumpled bed above which we can see the plain crucifix, suddenly sinks to the floor and kisses his bared feet.

The technical quality of *Rouge et Noir* is much above the often rather shoddy European technical standards. The French is so excellently spoken that an amateur, with the sometimes rickety crutch of the English subtitles, can get most of it. There is plenty left even if you miss the words.

BOOKS IN BRIEF

AFTERNOON OF AN AUTHOR, by F. Scott Fitzgerald, with an Introduction and Notes by Arthur Mizener (Scribner, $4.50). There is a very explicit justice in publishing these twenty heretofore uncollected stories and sketches by one of the surest novelists the first half of our century has given the future. In the last ten years of his lifetime, and especially since his death, Fitzgerald has suffered from an oversimplified legend: the first-rate talent who failed to produce. The image imparted by both Mr. Mizener's biography and Fitzgerald's own *Crack-Up* is that of a man stumbling downhill, drinking, groping, pitying himself, and doing little else. The truth is that during his most broken years, Fitzgerald was not only a great poet-novelist, but an equally great professional writer. Month after month, year after year, ulcered or hung-over, he produced stories and sketches and essays. These were not his innermost work. Tricks of the trade frequently show through. But the matchless narrative line is also there, light, unpredictable, effortless as a flame. And the sheer manliness of having stuck to his desk. Even without *The Great Gatsby*, this would have been heroic. As it is, it is comparable only to the similarly professional output which another afflicted, child-bride-haunted, and brilliantly ashamed genius, Edgar Allan Poe, kept turning out one hundred years before. R. PHELPS

THE GREAT DETERRENT, by Sir John Slessor (Praeger, $6.00). Sir John Slessor, Marshal of the Royal Air Force, has a wide range of observations, impressions, questions, and even small insights, in his quiver of quaint British phrase. But he apparently has only two *ideas*—that is, fairly important concepts that he is interested in selling: 1) that nuclear weapons constitute "the great deterrent," rendering continued large outlays on conventional weapons unrealistic; 2) that World War III will be a very short war, by reason of the deterrent's vast destructive power. Since the book is a collation of essays, lectures and letters-to-the editor, these ideas are not extensively developed. Instead, they are mixed in with, and blunted by, a great deal of "limited war" talk *à la* Kissinger, Paul Nitze & Co. "Limited war" is a concept difficult to reconcile with Sir John's idea that we should orient our thinking to a "short" war employing strategic atomic weapons—a matter of confusing implications, perhaps, rather than of direct contradiction. Similarly, occasional flashes of enlightenment are submerged in the general darkness of mechanistic Liberal thought on foreign policy. The whole is admirably smogged over by a put-and-take prose that those masters of retreat, the Messrs. Lippmann and Kennan, might be proud to own. C. LOGAN

THE ORGAN IN CHURCH DESIGN, by Joseph Edwin Blanton (Venture Press, Albany, Texas). This is a fascinating and informative study of the organ as a visual and architectural subject of the greatest importance for persons responsible for the design and decoration of a church. For them and for the organist and music lover, Mr. Blanton has presented a visual history of organs installed in churches, great and small, from the late Middle Ages to the present, in well over five hundred photographs. While the illustrations are in themselves of great interest, the book also calls attention to the vital, though concealed, interdependence between the acoustical, spatial and visual elements inherent in the nature of the pipe organ. Handsomely printed, clearly organized, carefully indexed and cross-referenced, Mr. Blanton's book is in one sense a first-rate historical encyclopedia of the organ. But it is more than this because the author's concern for the exercise of sound judgment—religious, aesthetic and practical—in the design and placement of organs constantly animates his writing. B. C. CANNON

To order any book reviewed in this issue, write:

THE BOOKMAILER, Inc.
Box 101, Murray Hill Station
New York 16, N.Y.

Return mail service—postpaid
PAY ONLY BOOKSTORE PRICE

$.....payment enclosed
Please send me: ..... (name of book)
.....
.....
Name .....
Address .....
.....
(No C.O.D. orders accepted; payment MUST accompany order. N.Y. City residents add 3% tax.)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To the Editor

Sacco-Vanzetti, cont'd

"The Sacco-Vanzetti Case" [April 5] and the letters of Arthur Schlesinger and Robert Montgomery [June 7] "hit me where I live." I am a military historian and ordnance (weapons) analyst. Both the facts and, particularly, the technical points of this case seem to have baffled both these writers.

Neither appears to be cognizant of the complete separateness of the bullet (metal projectile), the shell (empty brass case), and the cartridge (bullet-powder-case-unfired primer). The late Col. Calvin H. Goddard, my friend and teacher for many years, and often called "the father of firearms indentification," entered the Sacco-Vanzetti case late in the trial. He offered his services to the defense, which refused to accept them, then to the State, without charge.

Goddard proved that a shell (empty case) found near the body of Berardelli had positively been fired from the automatic pistol found on Sacco's person (automatic pistols, unlike revolvers, always eject fired cases). Similar microscopic tests with "fatal bullet no. 3" and bullets fired from Sacco's weapon into sawdust, satisfied the defense expert that "that bullet could not have come from any other gun."

The above evidence is to be found in *Science Catches the Criminal,* by Henry Morton Robinson (Blue Ribbon Books, New York, 1935), pages 82-86.

Washington, D.C. F. W. FOSTER GLEASON

At Last!

. . . those brilliant, hilarious Kreuttner cartoons — now collected for the *first time!*

"Inside Liberalism"

with John D. Kreuttner

. . . a scathing and side-splitting look at that mess, the Liberal Mind, by one of America's brightest, most perceptive political cartoonists.

24 Masterful Cartoons

in a

Handsome 8-Page Portfolio

only 60¢*

(*Two copies for $1.00,

15 for $5.00)

Bulk prices on request

Write Dept. K, National Review

211 E. 37th St., New York 16, N. Y.

The AAUP Loses a Member

Mr. Robert K. Carr ["To the Editor," June 7] is doubtless right about the AAUP membership, of course, but what he does not say is that the membership of January 1, 1955, was 43,615 or 6,252 more than the 37,363 that he can report for three years later. The figure for the beginning of 1955 is from the official *AAUP Bulletin,* Spring 1955, p. 170.

I was a member until the ADAcrats made their control of the association too plain, and I stopped paying dues.

Auburn, Ala. T. C. HOEPFNER

Senator Smith, Please Explain

I have read Mr. Farr's fine report on the sequel to the Matusow affair, [May 31] and other than to say that it is NATIONAL REVIEW at its best, I only suggest one comment. The dust-jacket of Cameron and Kahn's book by Matusow carries a plug for Matusow by Senator Margaret Chase Smith. Whether it was done with her permission I do not know, but it is still on the book in the circulation room at the 42nd Street Library [in New York City] and I have never heard any explanation from the person who could not in good conscience sign a testimonial to the memory of Sen. McCarthy, as to why she has assisted in promoting a book written by a convicted perjurer.

Hulett's Landing, N.Y. J. F. KELLY

A Frenchwoman Looks at de Gaulle

We in France have been living through historic days that have shaken the country to its foundations and are ushering in an entirely new structure of the State; all this miraculously without any bloodshed! It seems hard to believe that less than a week ago, on the somber day of May 28, we went to bed wondering if the next morning was to bring a Popular Front, civil war or both! Instead we got de Gaulle—the only possible solution—and by a series of steps that makes one feel that Joan of Arc must be invisibly running the show.

I wrote an article on de Gaulle in 1951 when the U.S. was convinced he was coming to power because of the big vote of the R.P.F. My thorough soundings of opinion at that time convinced me that it was impossible, and that he never would take over except in most stormy weather or some national catastrophe, which is the present case.

To my knowledge the American press has not yet broached the subject of this new structure of the State more than to retain the word "federative" mentioned by de Gaulle in his speech. Marc Lauriol, a jurist and third-generation Algerian, has worked out a remarkable project to deal with the thorny question of "integration" (and since May 13 Moslems and French Algerians will hear of nothing else). This integration can be made possible within a federal system that will respect Moslem customs. To what degree de Gaulle may adopt the Lauriol plan I can't yet say, but something will surely be made more clear after the General arrives in Algiers (with the surprises in store he'll need Joan of Arc at his side for *that* assignment!).

France is on the threshold of her greatest adventure since 1789. The free "association" of former colonial peoples with a renovated French political structure, after the initial hesitations and inevitable difficulties, will open up a future of vast pos-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sibilities for the great Eurafrica about to come into existence and which will give France a mission worthy of her real "grandeur."

There is not the slightest intention of a reconquest of Tunis or Morocco —though the present fears of it explain much of the actual psychosis. The great African prestige of de Gaulle (Black Africa adores him) and his solemn reassurance to Moroccans and Tunisians, will soon bring to an end the uneasiness of the two "independent" states. These latter may yet regret the status their Algerian brothers are to have!

Paris, France DOROTHY POULAIN

"Before You Say No . . ."

"All work and no play makes Jack a dull boy." Much as I like all the solid, erudite, thought-provoking (and to the average simple mind even sometimes slightly elusive) articles, I do believe that "Before You Say No . . ." [June 7] by Aloise Buckley Heath provides just the leavening that makes the cake.

Whatever you have paid her was not enough. The article is priceless.

New York City MRS. JOSEPH E. COGAN

Roots of Our Policy

James Burnham, in your May 31 issue, strikes at the core of one folly in our foreign relations. This had its inception when William Jennings Bryan was Secretary of State under Woodrow Wilson. At that time, any U.S. citizen thrown into jail in Latin America had great difficulty in getting an American Consul interested in obtaining release and fair trial. In contrast, a British subject receiving such ill treatment was promptly released on protest of a British Consul.

Why? Because Britain had nearly a hundred gunboats and small cruisers all over the world ready to stand into port within twenty-four hours in response to a call from a British Consul. Indeed, many an American learned to claim British citizenship when in difficulty. . . .

During Mexican revolutions, 1914-17, I was an officer on a U.S. cruiser purportedly "protecting American interests." But my commander was obliged to report and request orders from Washington (always late in coming) before sending in a landing party. We lay off the port of Manzanillo and watched the mob burn up the town, including property of Americans. In line with President Wilson's policy, Mr. Bryan countered complaints from U.S. citizens with the statement: "Americans who do not like Mexico can come home."

. . . Is it surprising that the German U-boat sank the Lusitania? In 1914-15, the Germans did not believe we would ever fight, based largely on the manner in which Huerta and Carranza intimidated Bryan and Wilson.

Today, the danger grows that Russia may make the same assumptions that Germany made in 1915.

New York City R. NELSON HICKMAN

DEWEY PRAGMATICALLY TESTED

(*Continued from p. 12*)

ous. Education is the formal means for transmitting culture. Culture is built up slowly and painfully, over the ages, by an elaborate process; and it is preserved, and extended, by certain subtle disciplines of mind and character, expressed in a people's theology, in their poetry, in their historical literature, in custom and habit and precedent. Disciplines so comparatively simple as reading and writing and figuring are dependent upon a continuity of method and training. When that continuity is snapped by the imprudent reformer, it may be extremely difficult—and sometimes next to impossible—to atone for the blunder. It is terribly hard to revive classical studies, for instance—supposing that classical studies become respectable once more after long neglect—when (as in 1957) only two persons in the whole of the United States are awarded doctorates in Greek. It is no less difficult to revive sound historical studies when the very teachers have lost interest in their vocation; or to revive decent manners in a mannerless generation. For society is not an inanimate substance on a laboratory table. Society is vital, with a spiritual unity; and if it is treated as so much lifeless flesh on the butcher's block, the best intentions of the kindest pragmatic reformer will not restore society's continuity. The reformer, as Santayana writes, never knows how close to the root of the tree he may be hacking. Dewey hacked hard at the roots of our educational system.

So I do not think that posterity will bless John Dewey. The reaction against his ideas is healthy. As the late Roy Campbell said, the body that cannot react is a corpse. That we still can react against Instrumentalism is some sign that there is sense in this nation yet.

RUSSELL KIRK
Author of *The Conservative Mind*
is now editing *MODERN AGE:*
A CONSERVATIVE REVIEW
Quarterly—$3.00 a year
FREE COPY ON REQUEST
Write Foundation for
Foreign Affairs, Inc.
64 E. Jackson Blvd., Chicago 4, Ill.

CLASSIFIED

NATIONAL REVIEW *accepts classified advertisements for personal services, items wanted or for sale, jobs sought or available, houses or apartments for sale or rent, and miscellaneous subjects of a comparable nature.* NATIONAL REVIEW *reserves the right to reject any copy deemed unsuitable. Rates per insertion: 40¢ per word, minimum 10 words; 30¢ per word for 25 or more insertions per year. If a box number is desired, count two extra words. Text, accompanied by full payment in the form of cash, check or money order, must be received 17 days before publication date. All responses to box numbers will be forwarded and postage billed periodically. Mail to be called for at* NATIONAL REVIEW *will be held 60 days only. Address: Classified Dept.,* NATIONAL REVIEW, *211 East 37th Street, New York 16, N. Y.*

SUMMER SUBLET, Queens, furnished apartment, bath, modern, $100 month. VI 3-0866

APARTMENT WANTED: On the East side in Manhattan, unfurnished, suitable for bachelor. Will pay up to $100. Write Box 22.

CAPABLE LAW STUDENT wandering through Europe, Asia will perform any business tasks, contacts for you, your corporation. Box 7538, Chicago, Ill.

MAKE VACATION PLANS NOW! Worldwide service to suit individual requirements. Margaret Cone Travel Service, 520 5th Ave., N.Y. 36, OX 7-0796.

"GAULLISM OR SOCIALISM?"—a debate between Wm. A. Rusher, Publisher of National Review, and Jim Wohlforth, editor of *The Young Socialist*, will be held at the Hotel Great Northern, 118 W. 57th St., New York City, at 8 p.m. on Thursday, June 19th. Public invited—admission $1; students 50¢.

BOOKS SENT to public schools and libraries through The Bookmailer are tax-deductible. Box 101, Murray Hill Station, N.Y. 16, N.Y.

"THE POWELL CASE," now collected in one explosive, fact-filled, eight-page reprint. Available for a limited time only! Order now while the supply lasts; only 25¢ each, 10 for $2.00, 100 for $10.00. Write Dept. R, National Review, 211 East 37th Street, New York 16, N.Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What can your dollar do about Multiple Sclerosis?

1. It will help support research seeking to isolate the cause of this mysterious crippling disease. Over 50 separate research projects investigating the nature of Multiple Sclerosis are now under way.

2. It will help provide care for the people who have already been struck down by Multiple Sclerosis. There are 38 clinics in the United States which are either supported by the Multiple Sclerosis Society or are particularly interested in the disease.

3. It will contribute to the Fellowship and Scholarship Program of the National Multiple Sclerosis Society. This program encourages basic research among young scientists in areas related to the disease.

4. It will help inform the American public about this grim disease. Multiple Sclerosis afflicts 500,000 Americans and yet its symptoms are relatively unknown to the average person.

5. It *may* contribute to a major breakthrough in the battle to find the cure for Multiple Sclerosis. The first such breakthrough occurred in 1957 when a young researcher at the Washington University School of Medicine discovered that the site of disabling Multiple Sclerosis is a structure called the glial cell.

This vastly important work could not have been done without the contributions of people like you to the National Multiple Sclerosis Society.

National Multiple Sclerosis Society
257 Fourth Avenue, New York City, N. Y.

Dear Sirs: Enclosed please find my contribution to the battle against Multiple Sclerosis.

Name _____

Street Address _____

City _____ **Zone** ____ **State** _____

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED